

LEVEL
ONE

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for July 1969

FLOOD OF PRAYERLESS TALK	<i>John Murray, S.J.</i>
OUTLOOK FOR THE SUDAN	<i>Tarboosh</i>
HIGH TIDE OF EMPIRE	<i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>
VIETNAM	<i>W. G. Smith, S.J.</i>
ECONOMICS OF DIVORCE	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
THE LORD'S DAY	<i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>
A PRINCE FOR WALES	<i>H. W. J. Edwards</i>

Renewing That Subscription

Once you have burrowed your way into the subscription records of a magazine like *Christian Order*, it takes no time at all to realize that renewals are everything.

There are, I suppose, two reasons for this. In the first place, *Christian Order*, of its very nature, is not the sort of publication that can increase its circulation by leaps and bounds. *Private Eye* has had a shorter life than *Christian Order*, yet its weekly circulation is, I believe, 50,000. *Christian Order* is not yet 5,000. The reason for the difference is, I imagine, fairly obvious.

Again, *Christian Order* is not interested in a changing readership; the sort of situation represented by a regular and heavy fall off in subscriptions being just about compensated for by an inflow of new subscribers on a temporary basis each year. I cannot see that much good is done that way.

The ideal situation from the point of view of *Christian Order* is represented by a high renewal rate combined with a steady intake of new subscribers each year. This is what we want and I am sure you will agree that it is a sensible objective. You will help us attain it if you are so kind as to renew, by return of post if possible, when you receive a letter from me to the effect that your subscription is now due. It would be a very real kindness if you would do this.

With very many thanks,
Paul Crane, S.J.

Contents

Page

386 ON EATING ROADS *The Editor*

388 A PRINCE FOR WALES
H. W. J. Edwards

396 THE LORD'S DAY
Francis Fenn, S.J.

401 AFTER THE COUP: OUTLOOK
FOR THE SUDAN
Tarboosh

409 CONGRESS AT LAUSANNE
Cyril Clump, S.J.

412 POVERTY AND ITS PRICE
E. L. Way

417 VIETNAM: MYTH AND
REALITY — An Australian View
W. G. Smith, S.J.

425 A CHANGING CHURCH IN A
CHANGING WORLD
John Murray, S.J.

434 ECONOMICS OF DIVORCE
J. M. Jackson

441 ANY QUESTIONS?
William Lawson S.J.

445 BOOK REVIEWS
Paul Crane, S.J.

If You Change Your Address :
Please let us know two or
three weeks ahead if possible
and please send us both new
and old addresses. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a
monthly magazine devoted to
the promulgation of Catholic
Social Teaching and incisive
comment on current affairs in
Church and State; at home
and abroad; in the political,
social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul
Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave
Road, London, S.W.1. This
is the sole postal address to
which all communications con-
cerning *Christian Order* should
be sent.

Christian Order is obtain-
able only by subscription and
from this address. In the case
of those desiring more than
one copy, these are obtainable
at the subscription rate and
should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to
Christian Order is £1 in the
United Kingdom and Republic
of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United
States, Canada and Australia;
elsewhere, according to the
approximate sterling rate of
exchange, in the currency of
the country concerned or any
convenient currency.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 10

JULY 1969

NUMBER 7

On Eating Roads

THE EDITOR

IT is important to notice that you cannot eat a road, for this is what governments indulging in massive and mounting public expenditure appear to imagine the citizen can do. Either this, or they are without the wit to see that men and women accustomed to a certain standard of living will not lie down meekly whilst governments rob them of it through ever-rising prices engendered by their public-spending programmes. The inclination of the citizen under such circumstances is to seek for increased wages to match rising prices in order that personal standards be maintained; and I, for one, cannot blame him for so doing. Ultimate responsibility for the state of affairs he is seeking to counteract through increased wages must lie with government. Not all the finger-wagging in the world can remove the fact that, in this country, Government started off the process in the first place and is still maintaining it through a level of public expenditure that is far too high. The proof that it is too high lies in the fact that citizens refuse to accept it. If they did not, the better-to-do would not be drawing on their savings and wage-earners pressing for increases in an effort to stave off the present depreciation of living standards caused by the general and

steady rise in prices ultimately caused by excessive public expenditure. All sections of the community are united against the Government in this regard.

It is worth looking at the process once again. Those employed on government programmes have got to live, whether they be manual workers or additional civil servants drafted by the Government in tens of thousands. They cannot eat the capital goods and services they produce. Their wages in the form of additional purchasing power bid up the price of available consumer goods; other consumers, in their turn, bid higher and so the upward spiral is on its way. It can be halted not by consumer restraint at the exhortation of government, but by government restraint in the interests of consumers, who are its citizens and whose interests it is meant to serve. Refusal to serve the interests of the citizen in this fashion rests on the altogether impertinent and unproven assumption that government knows better than its citizens what is best for them. To complete the picture of inflation through public-spending, one should note the additional and heavy inflationary element contained in the waste that accompanies all public expenditure of every sort. It is a great deal more pronounced than most imagine.

There are two ways of escape open to the Labour Government if it wishes to kill the present inflationary situation at home, along with the steady weakening of Britain's trading position abroad which is its inevitable concomitant. The first is to maintain public expenditure at the level decided by government and force citizens to accept it through the imposition on the country of a closely regulated economy. The second way of escape is that of massive cuts in public expenditure. Were a Labour Government to do this, however, it would seem to its followers to be betraying its ancestry. It would be without reason, in its own eyes, for its existence. Yet, such a road will have to be taken if the country itself, as well as the pound sterling, is to escape further devaluation; above all, if freedom ultimately is to be preserved.

It seemed only right that we should ask a Welshman, who is a true patriot, for his views on the forthcoming investiture of Prince Charles as Prince of Wales. He agreed with some misgivings. He had no reason for them. What follows is, we believe, on balance, as sound a view as will be found of the investiture and its significance for Wales. Henry Edwards writes here at his best.

A Prince for Wales

H. W. J. EDWARDS.

IN July, Prince Charles will be invested with great public pomp and pageantry at Caernarfon Castle. He will then be, as some reckon, the twenty-second Prince of Wales of English creation, though some would add Edward, son of Henry III, who, before he became Edward I, had conferred upon him the Principality of Wales when the domain was no more than a tract of land between the Conway and the Dee.

The Principality and Wales

The first Prince of Wales of English creation is generally regarded as Edward, son of Edward I, who was invested in 1301. But the Principality was even then by no means that of all Wales. The death of the last Llywelyn in battle at Cil Meri in 1282 led to Edward I's seizure of Llywelyn's lands—mainly in what is called Snowdonia (Gwynnedd). Young Edward was regarded as the successor of Llywelyn, though to Llywelyn's lands were added those of the princely house of Dynefor in Dyfed (West Wales) and some acres acquired by Edward I in baronial fashion.

Not until Henry VII invested his son Arthur could it be said that the Principality was that of all Wales. After the

several acts of incorporation, beginning with that of 1536, some parts of Wales were placed in England, notably the town of Clun by private act, and part of Montgomeryshire and Monmouthshire. A glance at a good map will show that there are a number of obviously Welsh places in Western Shropshire and Western Herefordshire: Bettws-y-Crwyn, Llanyblodwell, Llynclys, Pontrilas, Llandinabo and the Olchon Valley are random examples. It may be that the Principality extends to them just as the Duchy of Cornwall includes parts of Devon, not to mention the Wiltshire town of Mere. But this is to suggest that, in spite of the habit of journalists, the Principality must not be confused with Wales. Pope Benedict XV in his apostolic letter *Cambria Celtica*, placed Herefordshire within the Archdiocese of Cardiff, he no doubt having been advised of the Welshness of its western part. A further reform might put parts of Western Shropshire within Menevia, for even today one may hear the Welsh language spoken by the inhabitants of some districts. Oswestry, where *Y Cymro* is published, is as Welsh as it is English.

An Ancient Title

Brut y Tywysogion, the Chronicle of the Welsh Princes, shows how ancient is the title Prince of Wales. It begins with Cadwal, who abdicated in Rome in 681, though there were princes long before then. The most famous of the Welsh princes of the earlier ages was Hywel Dda (d. 980), who tried to unite the land and to subordinate the many petty princedoms by forming his famous laws, written, by the way, in the south-Welsh dialect. He was by no means anti-English. And Chesterton was right when he made a Welsh army fight for Alfred at the battle of Ethandune. In fact, six Welsh princelings led their armies into battle at Alfred's side.

The history primers which give 1282 as the date of the Conquest of Wales, ought also to take note of 1402, the year of the crowning of Owain Glyndwr. That is to say, a hundred years after the investiture of young Edward, Owain

Glyndwr, having won several battles against the English, was crowned Prince of all Wales at Machynlleth where he summoned his Parliament. The Parliament House still stands and is visited by many tourists. Owain ruled over an independent Wales until his death in 1415. Later, the House of Dynefor regained some of its power. Even as late as 1526 a bard could write:

"The king owns the island

Except what belongs to Sir Rhys".

The Lord Rhys of Dynefor, a Catholic, will be among the peers who will take a prominent part in the forthcoming investiture.

Waiting for Deliverance

After Owain's death, Wales was reconquered and the Welsh punished by penal legislation against which bard after bard complained. They and many other Welshmen began to dream of a mystical Owain who would deliver the nation from its enemies. Meanwhile, many Welshmen joined the French or English armies. Many took to the hills and fastnesses where they lived the lives of so many Robin Hoods, hoping for that Day which was to come, to quote Sion Cent. In the Wars of the Roses they supported one side or the other chiefly in relation to their own national aspirations. For example, they backed the Herberts, Earle of Pembroke, who were Yorkists. Then they backed the Tudor of Penmynydd, a Lancastrian. The same Welshman saw no inconsistency in backing a Yorkist now and a Lancastrian later. It all depended upon what they thought would best conduce to the Day of Deliverance.

It seemed to them that that Day had come when the third son of Henry of Penmynydd (he who had married Catherine, widow of Henry V), also named Henry, landed at Milford Haven. This seemed an answer to the prophecy that a deliverer would come from the sea. Henry told the Welsh that he had come to save the Principality from its misery, and Welshmen flocked to his banner which was, indeed, the Welsh Red Dragon. To make all well, after

his victory at Bosworth, Henry, now Henry VII, claimed the throne of England by right of conquest, named his eldest son Arthur, clothed his Welsh soldiers in the national white and green, celebrated St. David's Day at Court and did much else to persuade the Welsh that they had in him the Owain of prophecy.

Young Arthur was sent to preside over the Court of the Welsh March at Ludlow where he, learned beyond his years, distinguished himself. Alas, he died when he was sixteen years old. For that matter, only too many Princes of Wales of English creation have died young or have come to an untimely end.

Attempts to Crush Wales

Arthur's place was taken by his brother Henry who became Henry VIII and who incorporated Wales into England. Henry VIII was obviously hostile to Welsh aspirations. He called for the "extirpation" of the language, the usages and the customs of the Welsh. It is significant that in his apostolic letter, *Cambria Celtica* (1916), Pope Benedict XV gave as his reason for separating the hierarchy of Wales that Wales differed from England in language, customs and traditions. It will, then, be noted that Henry VIII's aim to extirpate the language had signally failed. Over three hundred years later it was spoken by almost all Welshmen in all the counties save Glamorgan, Radnor, and Monmouthshire, though in some parts of Glamorgan today, e.g. the Swansea Valley, the proportion of Welsh speakers is high.

The Court of the Welsh March, which for many Welshmen was a sign of Welsh distinctiveness and related to the Principality since Arthur's time, was abolished by William of Orange. No doubt the abolition pleased those of the English counties who came under its jurisdiction. There remained the Court of Great Sessions which Edmund Burke in 1780 attempted to reform. Burke's motion, which he withdrew after saying that the Welsh had been "poisoned" against it, was of very great constitutional importance. He

had discovered that not only the Principality of Wales but the Duchy of Cornwall, the Duchy of Lancaster and the County Palatine of Chester had separate judicatures and treasuries. He evidently intended to abolish them.

He wanted to reduce the number of judges of the Great Sessions from eight to three in order "more perfectly to unite the Crown and the Principality", as if union had not been achieved. Some who have studied the history that led in 1830 to the abolition of the Court of Great Sessions believe that Burke intended no injury to the Principality. Others believe that he wished to abolish it altogether. The latter argue that the abolition of the Great Sessions would mean the abolition of the Principality. Certainly, the utilitarian Jeremy Bentham and the Whig Brougham who accomplished the abolition of the Great Sessions were indifferent to decorative archaisms. We who have become accustomed to a liberal and even to a social-democratic régime, which subsists together with the hereditary monarchy and its concomitants, may find it hard to realise that in and after 1830—even in the first decade or so of Victoria's reign—there was strong republican sentiment in the United Kingdom.

But what, we may properly ask, is "the Principality"? Sir Edward Coke, that great jurist, held that there was a mystery about the original charter conferred upon Edward. Sir John Doddridge, who in 1630 wrote a learned work on the Principality agreed. He called it "a mystery of good policie". But he tried to shed some light. The title of Prince of Wales was not hereditary; it rested in the sovereign; the domain of the Prince might, on his becoming king, be "annexed, knit and united to the Crown to be of new conferred".

There remains a problem about the treasury. Burke complained that the Principality continued to enjoy a provincial separation in finance. At the time, he and others were perturbed because the king as Lord of the Manor of North Wales could not collect his dues, even though one Welsh adventurer named Probert, defended by an armed

posse, went to collect. In 1787 no less than £32,000 was demanded without avail—a large sum in those days.

Of course, the Principality is not the same as Wales, though journalists like to allude to Wales as the Principality. Were the title to be abolished, Wales would still exist. Here we come upon another example of the tendency to confuse nation and State. Today the Principality is no more than the corollary of a title of honour. I deeply regret this. But then I am an old-fashioned royalist. Although I have great admiration and not a little sympathy for those friends of mine who oppose the coming investiture, I deprecate their republicanism and their strange and false notion that we do not love pageantry. Why, there is no real Welsh word for “republican”! What the republicans do is to catch hold of the word “gwerin”, which really means a peasantry of long pedigree containing not a little princely stock, and use it as “people” to produce “gwerinaethwr”. (Because of the Welsh system of gavelkind as opposed to the English system of primogeniture, and because Wales never had any serfdom outside the Norman-held fringes, it is true to say that the gwerin of Wales is essentially aristocratic and even princely.)

Call for a Prince

Two decades ago the late Dr. D. J. Davies, a great Nationalist veteran and one of Plaid Cymru’s economists of those days, followed the lead of the late Walter Dowding, a convert to the Church, in making a plea for a Welsh Prince in an article in *Y Faner* headed “Wales Needs a Prince”. Dr. Davies in that article pointed to the catalytic importance of a prince. Moreover, though he had been a member of the I.L.P., he saw the advantages of the hereditary system in providing stability and continuity. A few Nationalists have agreed with him; but it must be said that most of them call for a prince of Welsh creation, who could, of course, easily be found. In this context one thinks of Bolingbroke’s Patriot King. Bolingbroke was an apologist for royalism; but he was not tempted to be a Jacobite. What he cared for was not a royal family but a royal office. What is in

question here is whether Wales needs a prince of this or that dynasty or whether Wales needs a prince of any dynasty. It is only too easy to see the pros and cons. It could be said that dynastic rivalry has been mixed with constitutional policy. For example, it is said that the quarrel between Yorkists and Lancastrians had to do with the role of the king in relation to that of the constitution. It may be said that the struggle between the Stuarts and their enemies had to do not only with this but with economic policy. It could, then, be argued that a Prince of Wales of English creation means that Wales must continue to be subordinate to England.

Present Trends

This argument may require modification because of certain evident tendencies in the recent history of Wales, tendencies which suggest that in some respects the Acts of Incorporation are becoming nugatory. We should also grasp the fact that radical alterations in English law come about usually by precedent broadening down to precedent.

In this century the Anglican church in Wales has been disestablished; a separate educational syllabus for Wales has been instituted; schools which use the medium of Welsh in all subjects have proved a signal success in anglicised areas and include a boarding school near Penybont ar Ogwr, founded by a man who started his working life as a coal miner; the laws relating to the opening of taverns depend upon local option; a Secretary of State for Wales has been appointed; a Welsh Whitehall in Cardiff is now apparent; postage stamps with the symbol of the dragon are on sale; a grace and favour law concerning the use of Welsh in official matters has been passed; Monmouthshire has now been officially placed in Wales; in spite of earlier assertions that the economic statistics for Wales could not be unscrambled from the England-and-Wales complex, through Dr. Edward Nevin, not a Nationalist, they have for some time been available. Have we reached a *Ne Plus Ultra*? Very far from it. But very much depends upon Prince

Charles, who has been a student at the University College at Aberystwyth under the tutorship of Mr. Millward, vice-president of Plaid Cymru, the Welsh Nationalist Party. Prince Charles on radio and TV has freely admitted that he understands the point of view of those who oppose his investiture, a minority certainly of the Welsh population but not therefore to be ignored.

A Minority is Opposed

They include in effect not only the so-called extremists, nine of whom are now on trial, but the Welsh Language Society which has mounted large demonstrations. Plaid Cymru is officially neutral, though its M.P. will not attend the investiture. Individual members of Plaid Cymru are openly opposed and quite un-neutral. Yr Urdd Gobaith Cymru, the large youth organisation, which had earlier announced its support, has reversed its decision to send delegates and is opposed. Opposition of a non-nationalist sort comes from some Socialists in and out of Wales, including the Members for High Peak and Ayrshire. The Celtic Youth Congress last year unanimously passed a resolution in Bangor opposing it. The motion was proposed by a young Catholic girl from Anglesey.

Reason for Hope

All this and more must daunt Prince Charles. But he has had a spartan upbringing and he has on radio and TV and in his other appearances in Wales won the affection of many of us. He began badly when on his coming to Wales he asked a demonstrator who Llywelyn was. But the blame must lie with his English educators. If a Cockney could stand as a Plaid Cymru candidate at the last General Election, there is no reason to suppose that ordinary nationalist sentiment would oppose the kind of Prince of English creation who decides to be a Prince for Wales, to work that Wales, under the spell of present tendencies, might secure at least a measure of autonomy in either a federal or a confederal realm.

What should our attitude be towards the Lord's Day? How would we react if a government 'staggered' the weekly day of rest? Fr. Fenn considers the basis on which our observance of Sunday rests, and gives an outline of Sunday observance from early times.

The Lord's Day

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

IN the last few decades ideas about the observance of Sunday have greatly changed, even among convinced Christians. In the Catholic Church, this change has been reflected in, for example, the introduction of evening Mass, with the relaxation of the eucharistic fast which makes it practicable. In some places, permission has been given for Sunday Mass on Saturday evening ⁽¹⁾.

Had we been alive in the year 386, when the Roman Emperor prohibited Sunday sports and theatres, we should probably have been looked upon as conservatives if we said we didn't see why these things should be banned, provided they did not interfere with Sunday Mass (though we would not have used that word). Now that we are in a reverse situation, what should our attitude be? And what should be our attitude if a government made known its intention to stagger the weekly day of rest?

Such questions make it necessary to consider exactly what it is on which our observance of Sunday is based. I begin by quoting the Vatican Council's *Constitution on the Liturgy*:

"By an apostolic tradition which takes its origin from the very day of Christ's resurrection, the Church celebrates the paschal mystery every eighth day; with

(1) *Instruction on the Eucharistic Mystery* (1967), C.T.S., art. 28.

good reason, then, this bears the name of the Lord's Day. For on this day Christ's faithful should come together into one place so that, by hearing the word of God and taking part in the Eucharist, they may call to mind the passion, the resurrection and the glorification of the Lord Jesus, and may thank God who 'has begotten us again, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto a living hope' (I Peter 1, 3). Hence the Lord's day is the original feast day, and it should be proposed to the piety of the faithful and taught to them in such a way that it may become a day of joy and of freedom from work". (2)

You will notice the positive tone of those last words: there is no mention by the Council of "abstaining from servile works", a law of the Church which has become, in any case, more and more difficult to put into practice or even to explain. The idea of servile work was unknown in the Church until the sixth century, when it was taken from Old Testament festival legislation as part of the development of Sunday as the "Christian sabbath".

The earliest Christians knew nothing of Sunday as a day of rest. Those in Palestine presumably observed, at least outwardly, the Jewish sabbath: we hear of no persecution of Christians because they did not keep it. Apart from this, there was no weekly day of rest in the Roman Empire. Stangely, to our ears, St. Jerome reports about convents for women in Palestine that, when inmates returned from church on the Lord's day, "they devoted themselves eagerly to work and made clothes either for themselves or for other people".

It was on March 3rd, 321 that the Emperor Constantine issued his decree which ran: "All judges, townspeople and all occupations should rest on the most honourable day of the sun." Farmers alone were exempt. A week with days named after the planets had been introduced into the Roman Empire early in our era: it started with Saturn's day, the keeping of which may have been influenced by the Jewish

(2) art. 106.

sabbath. Sun-day had no special significance until Constantine proclaimed it a day of rest; but worship of the sun was widespread at that time and the emperor may have hoped to please sun-worshippers by his action, as well as the Christian minority to whom toleration had been given after more than two centuries of persecution. But this was a secular holiday in no way influenced by the Christian Church.

So Christians were faced, like everyone else, with a workless day which most of them had little idea how to use. We know that the devil finds work for idle hands to do. Here is the witness of a sixth-century preacher:

"Many wait for Sunday, but not all with the same purpose. Some await it with awe and in order that they may send their prayer up to God and be fortified with the precious Body and Blood, but the idle and indifferent in order that they may have time for wickedness when they are free from work." (3)

It was in circumstances such as these that the sabbath commandment came to be applied to Sunday. Writing on the text "God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it", St. John Chrysostom says that God "is teaching us that among the days of the week one must be singled out and wholly devoted to the service of spiritual things." This, of course, is not the New Testament view:

"From now onwards, never let anyone else decide what you should eat or drink, or whether you are to observe annual festivals, New Moons or sabbaths. These were only a pale reflection of what was coming: the reality is Christ." (4)

The sabbath and other festivals of Jewish origin were shadows cast by what was to come. Now, the reality is here. The Law is fulfilled in Christ. Christians, too, "fulfil" the Law by consecrating every day to God. So St. Irenaeus in the second century:

(3) Quoted in *Sunday* by W. Rordorf: S.C.M. Press.

(4) Colossians 2, 16 (Jerusalem Bible).

"Nor will he be commanded to leave idle one day of rest who is constantly keeping sabbath, that is, giving homage to God in the temple of God which is man's body, and at all times doing the works of justice."

Christ has made possible such a "sabbath" way of life for all who believe in him.

It is worth noting that the well-known text, "Come to me, all you who labour, and I will give you rest" is immediately followed by a controversy with the Pharisees about the sabbath (5). An inward peace which has already begun for those who have faith in Christ will be brought to perfection when they enter into the eternal rest of God: "There remains a sabbath rest for the people of God" (6). Or, as a second-century Christian writer puts it: "Rest and be at peace, my people, for your repose will come".

In view of this spiritual interpretation of the sabbath by the early Christians, why, you may ask, did they set apart another day to be kept especially holy? The answer is that they did not. We have already seen that the idea of Sunday as a "holy" day came much later. To the first Christians, it was not a question of any day of twenty-four hours, but of a day on which to hold their weekly worship. And, if this is so, why did they choose the first day of the week? (The Jews had no particular names for the days of the week except for the sabbath and the previous day, the day of preparation mentioned in Mark 15, 42.) The question is answered in our quotation from the Vatican Council:

"For on this day Christ's faithful should come together into one place so that, by . . . taking part in the Eucharist, they may . . . thank God who has begotten us again, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead".

This is given as the reason why Sunday is called the Lord's day. This special Christian name for the first day of the week (7) is found in St. John's apocalypse (8). Earlier, St. Paul had spoken of "the Lord's Supper" (9)

(5) Matthew 11, 28 ff. (6) Hebrews, 4, 9-11.

(7) Acts 20, 7; 1 Cor. 16, 2; Luke 24, 1. (8) 1, 10.

(9) 1 Cor. 11, 20. (10) Acts 2, 42.

instead of using the term "the breaking of bread" (10). The Greek word corresponding to "the Lord's" is the same in both the Apocalypse and I Corinthians, and these are the only places in the New Testament where the word is used (11)! It does not seem fanciful to suggest that there is a connection between the two terms, and that in fact the first day of the week was named the Lord's day because it was the day on which the Lord's supper was held. It might seem a pity, then, that the Council did not use the latter term in place of "Eucharist", in order to point out the connection.

But we have not quite finished answering the question why the first day of the week was (and is) the Lord's Day. At the Last Supper, our Lord had told his apostles to "do this in memory of me", but he did not specify any particular day on which "this" should be done by the whole Christian community. The next occasion on which the apostles met Christ was at a meal on the evening of his resurrection (12). It is this contact with the risen and living Christ which is perpetuated in the Eucharist: "Maranatha"—our Lord comes!—was an early Christian acclamation by the people at the Eucharist (13). This is still the reason for the Sunday joy of which the Council speaks.

While we have the Council text before us, we may take notice of the words "Christ's faithful should come together *into one place*". This phrase derives from St. Justin, writing a description of Christian worship in about the year 150: "On the day called Sun-day, all, whether they live in town or country, gather together in one place".

(11) Rordorf, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

(12) Luke 24, 36 ff; cf. Acts 10, 41.

(13) McKenzie: *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 541.

Contents

Page

386 ON EATING ROADS
The Editor

388 A PRINCE FOR WALES
H. W. J. Edwards

396 THE LORD'S DAY
Francis Fenn, S.J.

401 AFTER THE COUP: OUTLOOK
FOR THE SUDAN
Tarboosh

409 CONGRESS AT LAUSANNE
Cyril Clump, S.J.

412 POVERTY AND ITS PRICE
E. L. Way

417 VIETNAM: MYTH AND
REALITY — An Australian View
W. G. Smith, S.J.

425 A CHANGING CHURCH IN A
CHANGING WORLD
John Murray, S.J.

434 ECONOMICS OF DIVORCE
J. M. Jackson

441 ANY QUESTIONS?
William Lawson S.J.

445 BOOK REVIEWS
Paul Crane, S.J.

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or
three weeks ahead if possible
and please send us both new
and old addresses. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a
monthly magazine devoted to
the promulgation of Catholic
Social Teaching and incisive
comment on current affairs in
Church and State; at home
and abroad; in the political,
social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul
Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave
Road, London, S.W.1. This
is the sole postal address to
which all communications con-
cerning *Christian Order* should
be sent.

Christian Order is obtain-
able only by subscription and
from this address. In the case
of those desiring more than
one copy, these are obtainable
at the subscription rate and
should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to
Christian Order is £1 in the
United Kingdom and Republic
of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United
States, Canada and Australia;
elsewhere, according to the
approximate sterling rate of
exchange, in the currency of
the country concerned or any
convenient currency.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 10

JULY 1969

NUMBER 7

On Eating Roads

THE EDITOR

IT is important to notice that you cannot eat a road, for this is what governments indulging in massive and mounting public expenditure appear to imagine the citizen can do. Either this, or they are without the wit to see that men and women accustomed to a certain standard of living will not lie down meekly whilst governments rob them of it through ever-rising prices engendered by their public-spending programmes. The inclination of the citizen under such circumstances is to seek for increased wages to match rising prices in order that personal standards be maintained; and I, for one, cannot blame him for so doing. Ultimate responsibility for the state of affairs he is seeking to counteract through increased wages must lie with government. Not all the finger-wagging in the world can remove the fact that, in this country, Government started off the process in the first place and is still maintaining it through a level of public expenditure that is far too high. The proof that it is too high lies in the fact that citizens refuse to accept it. If they did not, the better-to-do would not be drawing on their savings and wage-earners pressing for increases in an effort to stave off the present depreciation of living standards caused by the general and

steady rise in prices ultimately caused by excessive public expenditure. All sections of the community are united against the Government in this regard.

It is worth looking at the process once again. Those employed on government programmes have got to live, whether they be manual workers or additional civil servants drafted by the Government in tens of thousands. They cannot eat the capital goods and services they produce. Their wages in the form of additional purchasing power bid up the price of available consumer goods; other consumers, in their turn, bid higher and so the upward spiral is on its way. It can be halted not by consumer restraint at the exhortation of government, but by government restraint in the interests of consumers, who are its citizens and whose interests it is meant to serve. Refusal to serve the interests of the citizen in this fashion rests on the altogether impertinent and unproven assumption that government knows better than its citizens what is best for them. To complete the picture of inflation through public-spending, one should note the additional and heavy inflationary element contained in the waste that accompanies all public expenditure of every sort. It is a great deal more pronounced than most imagine.

There are two ways of escape open to the Labour Government if it wishes to kill the present inflationary situation at home, along with the steady weakening of Britain's trading position abroad which is its inevitable concomitant. The first is to maintain public expenditure at the level decided by government and force citizens to accept it through the imposition on the country of a closely regulated economy. The second way of escape is that of massive cuts in public expenditure. Were a Labour Government to do this, however, it would seem to its followers to be betraying its ancestry. It would be without reason, in its own eyes, for its existence. Yet, such a road will have to be taken if the country itself, as well as the pound sterling, is to escape further devaluation; above all, if freedom ultimately is to be preserved.

It seemed only right that we should ask a Welshman, who is a true patriot, for his views on the forthcoming investiture of Prince Charles as Prince of Wales. He agreed with some misgivings. He had no reason for them. What follows is, we believe, on balance, as sound a view as will be found of the investiture and its significance for Wales. Henry Edwards writes here at his best.

A Prince for Wales

H. W. J. EDWARDS.

IN July, Prince Charles will be invested with great public pomp and pageantry at Caernarfon Castle. He will then be, as some reckon, the twenty-second Prince of Wales of English creation, though some would add Edward, son of Henry III, who, before he became Edward I, had conferred upon him the Principality of Wales when the domain was no more than a tract of land between the Conway and the Dee.

The Principality and Wales

The first Prince of Wales of English creation is generally regarded as Edward, son of Edward I, who was invested in 1301. But the Principality was even then by no means that of all Wales. The death of the last Llywelyn in battle at Cil Meri in 1282 led to Edward I's seizure of Llywelyn's lands—mainly in what is called Snowdonia (Gwynnedd). Young Edward was regarded as the successor of Llywelyn, though to Llywelyn's lands were added those of the princely house of Dynefor in Dyfed (West Wales) and some acres acquired by Edward I in baronial fashion.

Not until Henry VII invested his son Arthur could it be said that the Principality was that of all Wales. After the

several acts of incorporation, beginning with that of 1536, some parts of Wales were placed in England, notably the town of Clun by private act, and part of Montgomeryshire and Monmouthshire. A glance at a good map will show that there are a number of obviously Welsh places in Western Shropshire and Western Herefordshire: Bettws-y-Crwyn, Llanyblodwell, Llynclys, Pontrilas, Llandinabo and the Olchon Valley are random examples. It may be that the Principality extends to them just as the Duchy of Cornwall includes parts of Devon, not to mention the Wiltshire town of Mere. But this is to suggest that, in spite of the habit of journalists, the Principality must not be confused with Wales. Pope Benedict XV in his apostolic letter *Cambria Celtica*, placed Herefordshire within the Archdiocese of Cardiff, he no doubt having been advised of the Welshness of its western part. A further reform might put parts of Western Shropshire within Menevia, for even today one may hear the Welssh language spoken by the inhabitants of some districts. Oswestry, where *Y Cymro* is published, is as Welsh as it is English.

An Ancient Title

Brut y Tywysogion, the Chronicle of the Welsh Princes, shows how ancient is the title Prince of Wales. It begins with Cadwal, who abdicated in Rome in 681, though there were princes long before then. The most famous of the Welsh princes of the earlier ages was Hywel Dda (d. 980), who tried to unite the land and to subordinate the many petty princedoms by forming his famous laws, written, by the way, in the south-Welsh dialect. He was by no means anti-English. And Chesterton was right when he made a Welsh army fight for Alfred at the battle of Ethandune. In fact, six Welsh princelings led their armies into battle at Alfred's side.

The history primers which give 1282 as the date of the Conquest of Wales, ought also to take note of 1402, the year of the crowning of Owain Glyndwr. That is to say, a hundred years after the investiture of young Edward, Owain

Glyndwr, having won several battles against the English, was crowned Prince of all Wales at Machynlleth where he summoned his Parliament. The Parliament House still stands and is visited by many tourists. Owain ruled over an independent Wales until his death in 1415. Later, the House of Dynefor regained some of its power. Even as late as 1526 a bard could write:

"The king owns the island
Except what belongs to Sir Rhys".

The Lord Rhys of Dynefor, a Catholic, will be among the peers who will take a prominent part in the forthcoming investiture.

Waiting for Deliverance

After Owain's death, Wales was reconquered and the Welsh punished by penal legislation against which bard after bard complained. They and many other Welshmen began to dream of a mystical Owain who would deliver the nation from its enemies. Meanwhile, many Welshmen joined the French or English armies. Many took to the hills and fastnesses where they lived the lives of so many Robin Hoods, hoping for that Day which was to come, to quote Sion Cent. In the Wars of the Roses they supported one side or the other chiefly in relation to their own national aspirations. For example, they backed the Herberts, Earle of Pembroke, who were Yorkists. Then they backed the Tudor of Penmynydd, a Lancastrian. The same Welshman saw no inconsistency in backing a Yorkist now and a Lancastrian later. It all depended upon what they thought would best conduce to the Day of Deliverance.

It seemed to them that that Day had come when the third son of Henry of Penmynydd (he who had married Catherine, widow of Henry V), also named Henry, landed at Milford Haven. This seemed an answer to the prophecy that a deliverer would come from the sea. Henry told the Welsh that he had come to save the Principality from its misery, and Welshmen flocked to his banner which was, indeed, the Welsh Red Dragon. To make all well, after

his victory at Bosworth, Henry, now Henry VII, claimed the throne of England by right of conquest, named his eldest son Arthur, clothed his Welsh soldiers in the national white and green, celebrated St. David's Day at Court and did much else to persuade the Welsh that they had in him the Owain of prophecy.

Young Arthur was sent to preside over the Court of the Welsh March at Ludlow where he, learned beyond his years, distinguished himself. Alas, he died when he was sixteen years old. For that matter, only too many Princes of Wales of English creation have died young or have come to an untimely end.

Attempts to Crush Wales

Arthur's place was taken by his brother Henry who became Henry VIII and who incorporated Wales into England. Henry VIII was obviously hostile to Welsh aspirations. He called for the "extirpation" of the language, the usages and the customs of the Welsh. It is significant that in his apostolic letter, *Cambria Celtica* (1916), Pope Benedict XV gave as his reason for separating the hierarchy of Wales that Wales differed from England in language, customs and traditions. It will, then, be noted that Henry VIII's aim to extirpate the language had signally failed. Over three hundred years later it was spoken by almost all Welshmen in all the counties save Glamorgan, Radnor, and Monmouthshire, though in some parts of Glamorgan today, e.g. the Swansea Valley, the proportion of Welsh speakers is high.

The Court of the Welsh March, which for many Welshmen was a sign of Welsh distinctiveness and related to the Principality since Arthur's time, was abolished by William of Orange. No doubt the abolition pleased those of the English counties who came under its jurisdiction. There remained the Court of Great Sessions which Edmund Burke in 1780 attempted to reform. Burke's motion, which he withdrew after saying that the Welsh had been "poisoned" against it, was of very great constitutional importance. He

had discovered that not only the Principality of Wales but the Duchy of Cornwall, the Duchy of Lancaster and the County Palatine of Chester had separate judicatures and treasuries. He evidently intended to abolish them.

He wanted to reduce the number of judges of the Great Sessions from eight to three in order "more perfectly to unite the Crown and the Principality", as if union had not been achieved. Some who have studied the history that led in 1830 to the abolition of the Court of Great Sessions believe that Burke intended no injury to the Principality. Others believe that he wished to abolish it altogether. The latter argue that the abolition of the Great Sessions would mean the abolition of the Principality. Certainly, the utilitarian Jeremy Bentham and the Whig Brougham who accomplished the abolition of the Great Sessions were indifferent to decorative archaisms. We who have become accustomed to a liberal and even to a social-democratic régime, which subsists together with the hereditary monarchy and its concomitants, may find it hard to realise that in and after 1830—even in the first decade or so of Victoria's reign—there was strong republican sentiment in the United Kingdom.

But what, we may properly ask, is "the Principality"? Sir Edward Coke, that great jurist, held that there was a mystery about the original charter conferred upon Edward. Sir John Doddridge, who in 1630 wrote a learned work on the Principality agreed. He called it "a mystery of good policie". But he tried to shed some light. The title of Prince of Wales was not hereditary; it rested in the sovereign; the domain of the Prince might, on his becoming king, be "annexed, knit and united to the Crown to be of new conferred".

There remains a problem about the treasury. Burke complained that the Principality continued to enjoy a provincial separation in finance. At the time, he and others were perturbed because the king as Lord of the Manor of North Wales could not collect his dues, even though one Welsh adventurer named Probert, defended by an armed

posse, went to collect. In 1787 no less than £32,000 was demanded without avail—a large sum in those days.

Of course, the Principality is not the same as Wales, though journalists like to allude to Wales as the Principality. Were the title to be abolished, Wales would still exist. Here we come upon another example of the tendency to confuse nation and State. Today the Principality is no more than the corollary of a title of honour. I deeply regret this. But then I am an old-fashioned royalist. Although I have great admiration and not a little sympathy for those friends of mine who oppose the coming investiture, I deprecate their republicanism and their strange and false notion that we do not love pageantry. Why, there is no real Welsh word for “republican”! What the republicans do is to catch hold of the word “gwerin”, which really means a peasantry of long pedigree containing not a little princely stock, and use it as “people” to produce “gwerinaethwr”. (Because of the Welsh system of gavelkind as opposed to the English system of primogeniture, and because Wales never had any serfdom outside the Norman-held fringes, it is true to say that the gwerin of Wales is essentially aristocratic and even princely.)

Call for a Prince

Two decades ago the late Dr. D. J. Davies, a great Nationalist veteran and one of Plaid Cymru’s economists of those days, followed the lead of the late Walter Dowding, a convert to the Church, in making a plea for a Welsh Prince in an article in *Y Faner* headed “Wales Needs a Prince”. Dr. Davies in that article pointed to the catalytic importance of a prince. Moreover, though he had been a member of the I.L.P., he saw the advantages of the hereditary system in providing stability and continuity. A few Nationalists have agreed with him; but it must be said that most of them call for a prince of Welsh creation, who could, of course, easily be found. In this context one thinks of Bolingbroke’s Patriot King. Bolingbroke was an apologist for royalism; but he was not tempted to be a Jacobite. What he cared for was not a royal family but a royal office. What is in

question here is whether Wales needs a prince of this or that dynasty or whether Wales needs a prince of any dynasty. It is only too easy to see the pros and cons. It could be said that dynastic rivalry has been mixed with constitutional policy. For example, it is said that the quarrel between Yorkists and Lancastrians had to do with the role of the king in relation to that of the constitution. It may be said that the struggle between the Stuarts and their enemies had to do not only with this but with economic policy. It could, then, be argued that a Prince of Wales of English creation means that Wales must continue to be subordinate to England.

Present Trends

This argument may require modification because of certain evident tendencies in the recent history of Wales, tendencies which suggest that in some respects the Acts of Incorporation are becoming nugatory. We should also grasp the fact that radical alterations in English law come about usually by precedent broadening down to precedent.

In this century the Anglican church in Wales has been disestablished; a separate educational syllabus for Wales has been instituted; schools which use the medium of Welsh in all subjects have proved a signal success in anglicised areas and include a boarding school near Penybont ar Ogwr, founded by a man who started his working life as a coal miner; the laws relating to the opening of taverns depend upon local option; a Secretary of State for Wales has been appointed; a Welsh Whitehall in Cardiff is now apparent; postage stamps with the symbol of the dragon are on sale; a grace and favour law concerning the use of Welsh in official matters has been passed; Monmouthshire has now been officially placed in Wales; in spite of earlier assertions that the economic statistics for Wales could not be unscrambled from the England-and-Wales complex, through Dr. Edward Nevin, not a Nationalist, they have for some time been available. Have we reached a Ne Plus Ultra? Very far from it. But very much depends upon Prince

Charles, who has been a student at the University College at Aberystwyth under the tutorship of Mr. Millward, vice-president of Plaid Cymru, the Welsh Nationalist Party. Prince Charles on radio and TV has freely admitted that he understands the point of view of those who oppose his investiture, a minority certainly of the Welsh population but not therefore to be ignored.

A Minority is Opposed

They include in effect not only the so-called extremists, nine of whom are now on trial, but the Welsh Language Society which has mounted large demonstrations. Plaid Cymru is officially neutral, though its M.P. will not attend the investiture. Individual members of Plaid Cymru are openly opposed and quite un-neutral. Yr Urdd Gobaith Cymru, the large youth organisation, which had earlier announced its support, has reversed its decision to send delegates and is opposed. Opposition of a non-nationalist sort comes from some Socialists in and out of Wales, including the Members for High Peak and Ayrshire. The Celtic Youth Congress last year unanimously passed a resolution in Bangor opposing it. The motion was proposed by a young Catholic girl from Anglesey.

Reason for Hope

All this and more must daunt Prince Charles. But he has had a spartan upbringing and he has on radio and TV and in his other appearances in Wales won the affection of many of us. He began badly when on his coming to Wales he asked a demonstrator who Llywelyn was. But the blame must lie with his English educators. If a Cockney could stand as a Plaid Cymru candidate at the last General Election, there is no reason to suppose that ordinary nationalist sentiment would oppose the kind of Prince of English creation who decides to be a Prince for Wales, to work that Wales, under the spell of present tendencies, might secure at least a measure of autonomy in either a federal or a confederal realm.

What should our attitude be towards the Lord's Day? How would we react if a government 'staggered' the weekly day of rest? Fr. Fenn considers the basis on which our observance of Sunday rests, and gives an outline of Sunday observance from early times.

The Lord's Day

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

IN the last few decades ideas about the observance of Sunday have greatly changed, even among convinced Christians. In the Catholic Church, this change has been reflected in, for example, the introduction of evening Mass, with the relaxation of the eucharistic fast which makes it practicable. In some places, permission has been given for Sunday Mass on Saturday evening ⁽¹⁾.

Had we been alive in the year 386, when the Roman Emperor prohibited Sunday sports and theatres, we should probably have been looked upon as conservatives if we said we didn't see why these things should be banned, provided they did not interfere with Sunday Mass (though we would not have used that word). Now that we are in a reverse situation, what should our attitude be? And what should be our attitude if a government made known its intention to stagger the weekly day of rest?

Such questions make it necessary to consider exactly what it is on which our observance of Sunday is based. I begin by quoting the Vatican Council's *Constitution on the Liturgy*:

"By an apostolic tradition which takes its origin from the very day of Christ's resurrection, the Church celebrates the paschal mystery every eighth day; with

(1) *Instruction on the Eucharistic Mystery* (1967), C.T.S., art. 28.

good reason, then, this bears the name of the Lord's Day. For on this day Christ's faithful should come together into one place so that, by hearing the word of God and taking part in the Eucharist, they may call to mind the passion, the resurrection and the glorification of the Lord Jesus, and may thank God who 'has begotten us again, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto a living hope' (I Peter 1, 3). Hence the Lord's day is the original feast day, and it should be proposed to the piety of the faithful and taught to them in such a way that it may become a day of joy and of freedom from work". (2)

You will notice the positive tone of those last words: there is no mention by the Council of "abstaining from servile works", a law of the Church which has become, in any case, more and more difficult to put into practice or even to explain. The idea of servile work was unknown in the Church until the sixth century, when it was taken from Old Testament festival legislation as part of the development of Sunday as the "Christian sabbath".

The earliest Christians knew nothing of Sunday as a day of rest. Those in Palestine presumably observed, at least outwardly, the Jewish sabbath: we hear of no persecution of Christians because they did not keep it. Apart from this, there was no weekly day of rest in the Roman Empire. Strangely, to our ears, St. Jerome reports about convents for women in Palestine that, when inmates returned from church on the Lord's day, "they devoted themselves eagerly to work and made clothes either for themselves or for other people".

It was on March 3rd, 321 that the Emperor Constantine issued his decree which ran: "All judges, townspeople and all occupations should rest on the most honourable day of the sun." Farmers alone were exempt. A week with days named after the planets had been introduced into the Roman Empire early in our era: it started with Saturn's day, the keeping of which may have been influenced by the Jewish

(2) art. 106.

sabbath. Sun-day had no special significance until Constantine proclaimed it a day of rest; but worship of the sun was widespread at that time and the emperor may have hoped to please sun-worshippers by his action, as well as the Christian minority to whom toleration had been given after more than two centuries of persecution. But this was a secular holiday in no way influenced by the Christian Church.

So Christians were faced, like everyone else, with a workless day which most of them had little idea how to use. We know that the devil finds work for idle hands to do. Here is the witness of a sixth-century preacher:

"Many wait for Sunday, but not all with the same purpose. Some await it with awe and in order that they may send their prayer up to God and be fortified with the precious Body and Blood, but the idle and indifferent in order that they may have time for wickedness when they are free from work." (3)

It was in circumstances such as these that the sabbath commandment came to be applied to Sunday. Writing on the text "God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it", St. John Chrysostom says that God "is teaching us that among the days of the week one must be singled out and wholly devoted to the service of spiritual things." This, of course, is not the New Testament view:

"From now onwards, never let anyone else decide what you should eat or drink, or whether you are to observe annual festivals, New Moons or sabbaths. These were only a pale reflection of what was coming: the reality is Christ." (4)

The sabbath and other festivals of Jewish origin were shadows cast by what was to come. Now, the reality is here. The Law is fulfilled in Christ. Christians, too, "fulfil" the Law by consecrating every day to God. So St. Irenaeus in the second century:

(3) Quoted in *Sunday* by W. Rordorf: S.C.M. Press.

(4) Colossians 2, 16 (Jerusalem Bible).

"Nor will he be commanded to leave idle one day of rest who is constantly keeping sabbath, that is, giving homage to God in the temple of God which is man's body, and at all times doing the works of justice."

Christ has made possible such a "sabbath" way of life for all who believe in him.

It is worth noting that the well-known text, "Come to me, all you who labour, and I will give you rest" is immediately followed by a controversy with the Pharisees about the sabbath ⁽⁵⁾. An inward peace which has already begun for those who have faith in Christ will be brought to perfection when they enter into the eternal rest of God: "There remains a sabbath rest for the people of God" ⁽⁶⁾. Or, as a second-century Christian writer puts it: "Rest and be at peace, my people, for your repose will come".

In view of this spiritual interpretation of the sabbath by the early Christians, why, you may ask, did they set apart another day to be kept especially holy? The answer is that they did not. We have already seen that the idea of Sunday as a "holy" day came much later. To the first Christians, it was not a question of any day of twenty-four hours, but of a day on which to hold their weekly worship. And, if this is so, why did they choose the first day of the week? (The Jews had no particular names for the days of the week except for the sabbath and the previous day, the day of preparation mentioned in Mark 15, 42.) The question is answered in our quotation from the Vatican Council:

"For on this day Christ's faithful should come together into one place so that, by . . . taking part in the Eucharist, they may . . . thank God who has begotten us again, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead".

This is given as the reason why Sunday is called the Lord's day. This special Christian name for the first day of the week ⁽⁷⁾ is found in St. John's apocalypse ⁽⁸⁾. Earlier, St. Paul had spoken of "the Lord's Supper" ⁽⁹⁾

(5) Matthew 11, 28 ff. (6) Hebrews, 4, 9-11.

(7) Acts 20, 7; 1 Cor. 16, 2; Luke 24, 1. (8) 1, 10.

(9) 1 Cor. 11, 20. (10) Acts 2, 42.

instead of using the term "the breaking of bread" ⁽¹⁰⁾. The Greek word corresponding to "the Lord's" is the same in both the Apocalypse and I Corinthians, and these are the only places in the New Testament where the word is used ⁽¹¹⁾! It does not seem fanciful to suggest that there is a connection between the two terms, and that in fact the first day of the week was named the Lord's day because it was the day on which the Lord's supper was held. It might seem a pity, then, that the Council did not use the latter term in place of "Eucharist", in order to point out the connection.

But we have not quite finished answering the question why the first day of the week was (and is) the Lord's Day. At the Last Supper, our Lord had told his apostles to "do this in memory of me", but he did not specify any particular day on which "this" should be done by the whole Christian community. The next occasion on which the apostles met Christ was at a meal on the evening of his resurrection ⁽¹²⁾. It is this contact with the risen and living Christ which is perpetuated in the Eucharist: "Maranatha"—our Lord comes!—was an early Christian acclamation by the people at the Eucharist ⁽¹³⁾. This is still the reason for the Sunday joy of which the Council speaks.

While we have the Council text before us, we may take notice of the words "Christ's faithful should come together *into one place*". This phrase derives from St. Justin, writing a description of Christian worship in about the year 150: "On the day called Sun-day, all, whether they live in town or country, gather together in one place".

(11) Rordorf, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

(12) Luke 24, 36 ff; cf. Acts 10, 41.

(13) McKenzie: *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 541.

tion of Catholics and their Church in all sorts of activities and campaigns—many of them, no doubt, valuable and even necessary in their way, but few of them in any way related to the fundamental task and message of the Church. Hence, an immense amount of “busy-ness” and this ceaseless flow of talk. It can be so arid and superficial, so utterly sterile. Listen, in conclusion to T. S. Eliot:

“The Word of the Lord came unto me, saying
O miserable cities of designing men,
O wretched generation of enlightened men,
Betrayed in the mazes of your ingenuities,
Sold by the proceeds of your proper inventions.
I have given you hands which you turn from worship,
I have given you speech, for endless palaver,
I have given you My Law, and you set up commissions,
I have given you lips, to express friendly sentiments,
I have given you hearts, for reciprocal distrust.
I have given you power of choice, and you only alternate
Between futile speculation and unconsidered action . . .
Much is your reading, but not the Word of God,
Much is your building, but not the house of God,
Will you build Me a house of plaster, with corrugated
roofing,
To be filled with a litter of Sunday newspapers?”.

In this article Dr. Jackson gives some of the arguments which Catholics can use to oppose divorce, and also discusses the Divorce Reform Bill before Parliament noting especially that its financial provisions offer little or no protection for the innocent party when that party happens to be poor.

Economics of Divorce

J. M. JACKSON

AT THE time of writing, the Divorce Reform Bill is nearing the end of its passage through the House of Commons. The measure is one which few Catholics are likely to support—though no doubt these days one may find somebody ready enough to reject the traditional teaching of the Church in almost any sphere. Nevertheless, the question inevitably arises in our present society as to how far we should resist legislation that runs counter to Catholic teaching. On the one hand, it is certainly true that we should not seek to impose our views on the rest of society: on the other hand, it is not only our right but our duty to promote the common good, and this means resisting measures which are likely to prove socially harmful or to involve serious and manifest injustice to individuals.

The Catholic opposition to the changes in the law on abortion was fully justified insofar as the changes legalised in a wide range of situations the destruction of a human foetus which, in the traditional teaching of the Church is already a human being, a creature of body and soul, and destined to enjoy its creator for all eternity. If one accepts this teaching, one is bound to oppose abortion as vigorously as one would oppose legislation that sought to legalise the killing of any other innocent human being whose existence happened to be inconvenient to someone. The banning of the

sale of contraceptives would be quite a different case. However firmly one may accept the teaching of the Church in this matter, it is clearly a matter of private morality in which we should not seek to impose our views on others.

Divorce and the Common Good

A Catholic may believe that marriage is an indissoluble contract but feel, nevertheless, that if others do not agree there is no reason to interfere. Whilst it is possible for Catholics to take this attitude, it is by no means the only one open to them. Divorce may have consequences for society as a whole and not just for the individuals concerned. If we believe, for example, that a healthy family life is the basis of a sound society, then divorce laws which damaged family life would be contrary to the common good, and anyone would be justified in opposing such laws.

If we want to oppose a divorce law on these grounds, we need to make sure that our arguments are convincing. It would be necessary to show that there were, perhaps, seriously damaging effects upon the children of divorced parents. It would have to be shown that such children were more likely to become delinquent, or in some other way to become less useful members of society because their parents had been divorced. Moreover, it would be necessary to show that the damage done by divorce was greater than the damage done by the break up of a marriage without divorce, or by the parents continuing to live together in an atmosphere of hostility. The advocates of easier divorce would argue that divorce merely recognises that marriage has broken down, and that greater damage to society results from a failure to recognise this breakdown.

If there are socially damaging consequences of divorce, any measure for easier divorce may have a twofold effect. The short-run effect is the increase in the number of marriages broken up as a result of the new law. Over a longer period, the increasing ease with which divorce is available may lead to marriage being taken less seriously. The knowledge that there is an escape route may very well lead to young people

rushing into marriage with less thought than would otherwise be the case. This approach to marriage will mean that in an increasing proportion of cases a situation develops for which divorce would seem the obvious remedy.

This line of argument is logical enough, but it is by no means certain that much evidence could be found to support it. Divorces occur on an increasing scale, yet the great majority of marriages still appear successful and permanent.

I am not suggesting that divorce is not socially damaging, but I am suggesting that we should beware of using this argument until we have much stronger evidence. Like economists, Catholics are inclined to argue on the basis of how we think the world works and are disinclined to undertake serious empirical research to find out how it actually does work. In this particular context, it would be necessary to start by trying to find out, for example, whether there is more delinquency among the children of divorced parents than in the community as a whole. *Then*, it would be necessary to go further. Was there more delinquency among these children than others in similar income groups, or among children of widows or widowers, or among the children of unhappy marriages that were not dissolved. In this way, we would try to discover whether the high delinquency rate was the result of unhappy marriages, whether ending in divorce or not, and whether it was the result of divorce or of situations which might be associated with divorce. (1)

The Divorce Reform Bill

The bill before Parliament makes the irrevocable breakdown of marriage the sole ground of divorce. Nevertheless, it provides that five situations may be accepted as evidence of such breakdown. Three of these add little or nothing to the present law, allowing an injured party to petition for divorce on the grounds of adultery, cruelty or desertion. The fourth

1. Poverty or the absence of one parent might lead to similar results, whether resulting from divorce or not. If so, we might still argue divorce was undesirable because it created these situations which in turn had undesirable consequences.

case is that of so-called 'divorce by consent'. A petitioner may seek a divorce if the parties have lived apart for two years and the respondent does not object. ⁽²⁾ Finally, after five years' separation, a petition for divorce may be made even though the innocent party objects.

Divorce by consent may be socially damaging, but the evidence is not easily come by. Divorce against the wishes of the innocent party is another matter, for it is clearly an innovation which must inevitably involve in many cases serious injustice and hardship. Before granting a petition, the Courts must, it is true, take into account the financial arrangements which are to be made. In practice, however, the wording of the bill offers little protection to the innocent party. The Court must normally be satisfied that 'the financial provision made by the petitioner for the respondent is reasonable and fair *or the best that can be made in the circumstances.*' ⁽³⁾ What this provision means is that where a man has an income that carries him into the surtax bracket, he will be required to make adequate provision for his wife if he deserts her and then, five years later seeks a divorce. In a society that accepts divorce, there is little one can object to in this arrangement. After all, one cannot ensure by law that husband and wife continue to live together, and if the marriage has broken down nothing much is lost by the legal recognition of this fact.

If however, we look at the case of a man earning something like £22 a week, the national average, or even something much less, the situation is very different. Under such conditions, very considerable hardship may result for the deserted wife.

A Typical Case

A married man, with three children, earning £22 a week will be in a comparatively comfortable situation. Taking into account family allowances, income tax and National Insurance contributions, the family will have a disposable

2. Genuine consent is not necessarily the same thing as not objecting.

3. My italics

income of roughly £21 a week. Assuming the family to be paying £1 15s a week rent and rates, the Supplementary Benefit scale for this family would give them an income of roughly £12 10s a week (varying slightly according to the age of the children). Their actual income is, in fact, nearly 70 per cent greater than the appropriate Supplementary Benefit scale.

Now consider what happens if this family is split up by divorce, the wife is given the custody of the children and the man re-marries. What kind of contribution can the man be expected to make towards the support of his ex-wife and his children? The ex-wife will draw 38s a week in family allowances. If she continues to pay the same rent, she will need to be given an extra £9 8s just to bring her and the children up to the Supplementary Benefit scale. Can a man on the average wage of £22 a week be expected to pay £9 or more in maintenance to his former wife when he has re-married?

Income tax and National Insurance will leave him with roughly £20 a week to spend. If he and his new wife are to live even at the Supplementary Benefit scale, they will need something like £10 14s (again assuming a rent of £1 15s). Clearly, the cost of keeping the two households even at the Supplementary Benefit standard takes roughly the whole of the man's income after tax. If he were forced to pay on this scale, a man might just as well stop working and let the Ministry of Social Security support both of his families. In fact, the courts would not order maintenance on this scale to be paid.

Where a man is earning less than the average wage of £22 a week the position is, of course, even worse. Only where a man is earning substantially more than the average wage of £22 a week is there any real prospect of a divorced wife with several children receiving 'adequate' maintenance. Even then, we are thinking of adequacy in terms of minimum standards set by the Ministry of Social Security. These standards are by no means luxurious (perhaps rightly so) and for many divorced wives and their children will represent a disastrous

fall in living standards. The truth is that only a very well to do man can afford to support two families.

Supporters of the new legislation have opposed any suggestion that a divorce on the ground of five year separation alone should be refused unless adequate provision could be made in appropriate cases.

They opposed this because they said it would create one law for the rich and one for the poor. What they are determined not to see because they do not want to is that under their own proposals there will be very different treatment in effect for the rich and poor. They are reluctant to see their proposals modified so that the poor man is not able to dispose of an unwanted wife and leave the Ministry of Social Security to support her and her children. In the name of some crazy concept of egalitarianism, the man with a low income is to be given the same opportunities to get out of an unwanted marriage as the wealthy. But whereas the Courts may ensure that the wife of the wealthy man is adequately provided for, they are powerless to ensure reasonable provision for the wife of a poor man (or indeed the average man.) The so-called reformers do not, so they say, want one law for the rich and another for the poor. *But their own measures ensure that it is the innocent poor who suffer* because they prefer to pursue the goal of equality of opportunity for the guilty.

Some Further Considerations

The economic problems raised by divorce are, of course, greatest when a wife is left with young dependent children. If the children are older and she is able to work, the position will be a little easier. Nevertheless, there may still be hardship. A divorced wife may feel that she is compelled to work in order to raise her income above the bare subsistence provided by the Ministry of Social Security in circumstances which involve undue physical or mental strain or both.

Even in a case where it is possible for the woman to return to work without undue strain, her earning capacity may have been seriously reduced by marriage. She may, for example, not have worked for ten years while she had young children.

She may have reached the point where she would, in any case, have re-entered the labour market. If she is going back into a profession like teaching, she will be resuming at a salary very much less than that she would have reached if she had not married and been at home for ten years. This may be all right for the married woman returning to work to supplement the family income, or perhaps mainly for the work itself when the demands of the home have slackened. It is quite a different matter for the woman who may have to support herself and her children by her own efforts. ⁽⁴⁾ Even if a woman can support herself adequately, it is wrong that her husband should be allowed to desert her and escape all financial responsibility.

The position of the deserted wife will, of course, be even worse in a case where she married at an early age and failed to complete a training for a job matching her abilities. In such a case, she will find her earning power is limited, and, in addition, she may be forced into such employment as she can get with her limited training. A lot of people have to do jobs which are lacking in interest, but such jobs are particularly frustrating for somebody who has the ability but not the specialised training to do something more exacting.

As Catholics, we believe that divorce is wrong, that the marriage bond is indissoluble. A good many other people do not agree, and it would be unrealistic to suppose that we have much likelihood of getting them to change their ideas. On the other hand, to demonstrate that the changes now proposed (or even on the statute book by the time this appears) are likely to bring with them serious injustice and hardship is another matter. This is something that can be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt, as can the fact that where a defaulting husband cannot be made to support his ex-wife and family the burden is bound to fall on the rest of society.

4. If she has any substantial earnings from employment, she will have nothing further unless her ex-husband is making some payment to her. She can not, for example, try working half-time to supplement any payment from the Ministry of Social Security because such earnings would be deducted in full from the Ministry's scale of benefit.

Is shyness a symptom of pride? If people accept that "angels are out" how do they explain the fact that the devil is a person? A Catholic lecturer was quoted as saying "If you die unhappy, you die damned." Who is he to condemn the mass of mankind? The majority die unhappy.

Any Questions ?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Is shyness a symptom of pride ?

It is present in people long before they are capable of acquiring the moral virtues or vices, so it can't be a symptom of any of them. It is a natural dimension of personality. I should think most young children, like most young animals, have at least a touch of it — the world is new to them, and they are timid in face of its strangeness. They retreat from the unknown, and they come out of themselves only when their safety is somehow assured.

A sense of weakness or ignorance or inadequacy or inferiority stays with most people all their lives—or should stay with us in a degree which is in accordance with the essential dependence of our limited nature. An initial reserve with strangers is reasonable—it is not just a protection for our vulnerability but also a respect for their privacy. But, as we grow older, we have to learn how to esteem others more than we esteem ourselves and to give them the welcome of charity. Shyness, unless it is educated and made to take its place within a mature personality, can become a preoccupation with self, the wrong sort of self-consciousness that leads to fears and anxieties, envy and jealousy, touchiness, and an inability to use one's talents. Any initial shyness must not be allowed to get out of hand

and prevent us from trusting people and making life pleasanter for them.

Natural dispositions are not wholly subject to reason and will; but they can be controlled and made part of a balanced personality. Shyness can be brought into the person's service if he will accept himself from the providence of God and will have the courage of charity in his relations with others rather than the timidity of shyness.

**If people accept the idea that "angels are out"
how do they explain the fact that the devil is
a person?**

They don't explain what you call "a fact": they deny it. As they have rejected belief in angels, they can't believe that there are fallen angels.

There are several puzzles in this matter of getting rid of the purely spiritual creation. I can understand the concern of Scripture scholars to discover, by the ordinary means of scholarship, what "angel" means in the Bible. Is it a word for an inspiration from God, or for a personal messenger from God, or for God Himself? Are illnesses of body and mind diabolical possession, or material evils produced by wicked spirits, or just ordinary physical defects attributed through ignorance to a non-existent spirit world? As there are spirits both good and evil in most religious systems, some of them prior to or contemporaneous with the writing of the Old Testament, could not the scripture angels and devils be merely a borrowing or a following of fashion?

The first puzzle appears when that reasonable enquiry comes up against the clear words of Our Lord in the New Testament. He taught the existence of personal angels, good and bad. Taking Him at His word, the Church has always believed in a world of personal spirits. The denial of their existence can be maintained only by saying that Christ did not know—and that is to depart from yet another strong Christian tradition. The ingenuity of the "demythologizers" is then employed to take the obvious meaning out of pronouncements of the Fourth Lateran and the First Vatican

Councils, and to justify refusal of the guidance of Pius XII.

The second puzzle is that so many who have their biblical knowledge at third or fourth hand prefer to follow their choice of scholar rather than the teaching and praying Church.

A Catholic lecturer was quoted to me the other day as saying: "If you die unhappy, you die damned." Who is he to condemn the mass of mankind? The majority die happy.

And who are you that know the state of the majority in their last moments?

Judgment on the lecturer depends, doesn't it, on the meaning he gave to happiness? I can see such a meaning—one that is philosophically reasonable—which makes his statement acceptable. Your indignation arises because, understandably, you have adopted the ordinary meaning of happiness as a feeling of contentment and well-being. The act of dying could well cause distress, both physical and mental, with concern for oneself and for the dependants one has to leave bereft of one's presence. That is not, superficially, a happy state. But happiness, in its deeper sense, is possible even in the most distressing conditions; and in that sense one is *obliged* to achieve it. It is defined by St. Thomas Aquinas—and Cicero and St. Augustine say the same—as "the perfect good which excludes all evil and satisfies all desires". The perfect good is union with God. In its perfection it is not attainable until after death; and that is why in this world "our heart is restless", as St. Augustine says in his *Confessions*; but the condition of our ultimate perfect union with God in eternity is that we must be united with Him in time by charity.

That union, effected by our keeping the great commandment of love, gives us possession of ourselves. We make our own person good, that is, real and actual. Evil, which would be an absence of our true self, is excluded by the presence of our genuine self; and our chief desire is effectively on the way to being satisfied. In that realistic

sense we have a duty to get the best of both worlds—happiness both here and hereafter.

In view of the recent Vatican instruction that the training of priests and religious should prepare them for an effective ministry in a rapidly changing world, may we expect the contemplative orders to abandon their medieval futilities?

That word “medieval” again!—used as though it were an argument whereas it is only an adjective of time. Some of our finest Christian traditions spring from the Middle Ages.

The tradition of complete dedication to God in the keeping of the first Commandment is as old as Christianity, and it is modern in any age. The contemplatives exercise the virtues of faith, hope and charity in continuous prayer, maintaining not only themselves but the whole human race in worship of God. Those who think little of the religious who spend their lives in contemplation will find that they have been despising their greatest human benefactors. In these days especially, when faith is growing cold and sociology is the new religion, we need people who have their priorities right and know that prayer is essential for the well-being of mankind.

Training that equips clergy and religious for the service of their fellows in a technological society will no doubt include instruction in communications, computerized diagnosis in medicine, working conditions in industry, antagonism between races, the psychology of dwellers in sky-scrapers and all the rest; but if it does not help to the formation of habits of prayer it will send out into the harvest labourers who don't know the first thing about their job. They have to show faith, hope and charity; and the act of each one of those virtues is prayer—the raising of mind and heart to God, in deliberate and grateful acceptance of His presence, His providence, and His eternal love; and, if they themselves are men and women of prayer, those they serve will learn to pray, and the world will be warmer.

BOOK REVIEWS

High Tide of Empire

Pax Britannica by James Morris; Faber, 50s. pp. 544.

The Washing of the Spears by Donald R. Morris; Sphere Paperback, 12s. 6d.; pp. 670.

Gubulawayo and Beyond by Michael Gelfand; Chapman, 63s.; pp. 496.

Mr. Morris has chosen his moment well. At a time when this country has come as close as ever likely to the bottom it does no harm to take a glance at her when she stood at the top. This is what the author of *Pax Britannica* has done. His book is an impression of the Old Queen's Empire as it was at the time of her Diamond Jubilee. That was only seventy-two years ago. It seems like another world.

In fact it was. The English stepped out of their Empire after the last war as casually as they had stepped into it a good many years before. History may yet record that, in so doing, they were true to the instinct of their race which has known, as a rule, when and how to choose the moment. History's verdict may favour the timing and manner of their withdrawal or it may not. All one can say now is that we are too close to the scene to view it objectively and in true perspective. Meanwhile, the achievement itself, as it was at its apogee, can be studied with reasonable objectivity. Excluded are those still suffering from an overdose of nostalgia on the one hand and on the other—and far worse—the mean-minded who deride every type of achievement. Even less incapable of understanding what Empire really meant to the English and how it came about are the ideologues of the Left whose dreary penchant for a priori thinking makes every kind of personal achievement no more than a matter of dubiously mixed motives or else the uninspired offshoot of environmental malaise.

This is doubly unfortunate in the case of the British Empire, which was acquired, as has been said, in a fit of absence of mind and stamped, as no other before it, by the immensely varied personalities of its builders. There is a passage in James Morris' book which illustrates this to perfection:

"A symbolically disconcerting proclamation was once made by the Australians at a place called Thursday Island, in the remote tropical north of Queensland. This was the very top of Australia, separated only by the narrow Torres Strait from New Guinea, the East India archipelago and Asia proper, and it was one of the hardest places in the world for a big ship to get to: when the British India boats sailed along there through the islands their captains often stayed on the bridge for four days and nights, worrying their vessels through the shallows. On Thursday Island, off the tip of Cape York, there was a little town and a naval station—1,500 souls in all, with some fifty whites and a shifting community of Malays, Polynesians, Chinese, a few Japanese pearl divers and a few aborigines. The flag of the Queensland Government flew above the Resident Magistrate's house, and there was a little wooden prison, a post office, a storehouse for the Royal Navy's Australian squadron, a couple of pubs, two or three shops and a courthouse. Immediately behind this clutch of buildings was the bush, and the Sound all about was littered with low sandy islands, baked in the heat.

"It was a dismal place, away beyond the never-never, but if the Australians ever stamped out of the Empire, Thursday Island might be remembered as their Concord, for it was here that they first showed the world their independence. For years the Queenslanders had been urging the Imperial Government to occupy the island of New Guinea across the water, to forestall the Germans or the French. The British, who had more than enough islands on their books, repeatedly declined: so on March 30, 1883, the day after the English mail-boat had left for London, leaving northern Queensland conveniently incommunicado, the Resident Magistrate at

Thursday Island posted a proclamation in his official notice-board. It announced the annexation of all New Guinea, not by the Imperial Government at all, but by the Government of Queensland. A day or two later the Magistrate sailed across the Torres Strait, and ceremonially planted the Union Jack upon the soil of Papua. The British first annulled the annexation in a huff, then agreed to declare a protectorate over the south-eastern part of the island; and when, in 1884, the Germans took the north-eastern coast for themselves, the Queenslanders were understandably piqued."

Marxist ideologues who choose to interpret this kind of action in terms of the dialectic—seeing it as the fruit of some remote clash of opposites — cannot really be said to know what they are talking about when it comes to an understanding of Britain's Empire and its builders. Yet, the Empire is full of this kind of incident. Men, like the Queensland Magistrate, plunking the Union Jack on a stretch of foreign soil, are everywhere in the pages of its history. It is no exaggeration to say that the Empire was built out of their efforts. Its story is essentially an affair of personalities. As such, its depiction at the high point of its triumph is admirably suited to so gifted an impressionist as James Morris. He has succeeded extraordinarily well. His ability to convey atmosphere, to point a period, has rarely been so well displayed. One realises as well, reading his delightful pages, that his fine impressionist writing is grounded in an acuteness of observation coupled with a meticulous care for detail that most would envy. If Mr. Morris' impression of Empire is at once so vivid and so rich, final reason must be found in a mastery of the particular circumstance that makes his wider picture of Britain's imperial achievement almost incredibly rich. How much is conveyed, for example, in his almost casual aside to the effect that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police retained their red tunics on patrol particularly in order that they should be easily recognisable by roving Red Indians as men of the Queen and not the American President. The blue-

coated troops of the latter stood for something far more unpredictable to the Indian mind than the red-jacketed police of the Old Queen: with these, the Indians knew, there was justice and the predictability of something dimly sensed as the rule of law.

Donald R. Morris' account of the rise and fall of the Zulu nation reads all the better when set within the context of his namesake's wider impressionism. Nevertheless, his work stands easily on its own as a brilliantly vivid account of Victorian imperialism as it affected one small territory of the many that looked, at the time of the Diamond Jubilee, to the protection of the Old Queen. Morris' prose is splendidly terse and fast-moving. There is a touch, almost, of Hemmingway about it; but without the feeling of a thing contrived that comes, to me personally, a little too often in Hemmingway's writing.

And, finally, whilst Briton and Boer and Zulu were in the final scrappy stages of the long-drawn fight that ended with Zululand becoming a British Protectorate in 1887, a group of Jesuit Fathers headed north from the Cape for Matabeleland and the foundation of the Zambezi Mission. They were a mixed bunch of varied nationalities, all alike in their relative ignorance of what lay before them; all alike also in the courage with which they pushed off into the unknown interior of a continent whose people they wanted to bring to the knowledge and love of God.

Their letters and journals over eight years—from 1879 to 1887—have been edited with obvious love and great care by Professor Michael Gelfand, at present Professor of Tropical Medicine at the University College of Rhodesia. For the past thirty years, the Professor has been on the friendliest terms with many English Jesuits attached to the Salisbury Mission; and his book is dedicated to the greatest, perhaps, of them all, Aston Ignatius Chichester, first Archbishop of Salisbury. In the production of this fascinating book, Professor Gelfand has been assisted by Father. W. F. Rea, an English Jesuit teaching now at the University.

Paul Crane, S.J.

tion of Catholics and their Church in all sorts of activities and campaigns—many of them, no doubt, valuable and even necessary in their way, but few of them in any way related to the fundamental task and message of the Church. Hence, an immense amount of “busy-ness” and this ceaseless flow of talk. It can be so arid and superficial, so utterly sterile. Listen, in conclusion to T. S. Eliot:

“The Word of the Lord came unto me, saying
O miserable cities of designing men,
O wretched generation of enlightened men,
Betrayed in the mazes of your ingenuities,
Sold by the proceeds of your proper inventions.
I have given you hands which you turn from worship,
I have given you speech, for endless palaver,
I have given you My Law, and you set up commissions,
I have given you lips, to express friendly sentiments,
I have given you hearts, for reciprocal distrust.
I have given you power of choice, and you only alternate
Between futile speculation and unconsidered action . . .
Much is your reading, but not the Word of God,
Much is your building, but not the house of God,
Will you build Me a house of plaster, with corrugated
roofing,
To be filled with a litter of Sunday newspapers?”

In this article Dr. Jackson gives some of the arguments which Catholics can use to oppose divorce, and also discusses the Divorce Reform Bill before Parliament noting especially that its financial provisions offer little or no protection for the innocent party when that party happens to be poor.

Economics of Divorce

J. M. JACKSON

AT THE time of writing, the Divorce Reform Bill is nearing the end of its passage through the House of Commons. The measure is one which few Catholics are likely to support—though no doubt these days one may find somebody ready enough to reject the traditional teaching of the Church in almost any sphere. Nevertheless, the question inevitably arises in our present society as to how far we should resist legislation that runs counter to Catholic teaching. On the one hand, it is certainly true that we should not seek to impose our views on the rest of society: on the other hand, it is not only our right but our duty to promote the common good, and this means resisting measures which are likely to prove socially harmful or to involve serious and manifest injustice to individuals.

The Catholic opposition to the changes in the law on abortion was fully justified insofar as the changes legalised in a wide range of situations the destruction of a human foetus which, in the traditional teaching of the Church is already a human being, a creature of body and soul, and destined to enjoy its creator for all eternity. If one accepts this teaching, one is bound to oppose abortion as vigorously as one would oppose legislation that sought to legalise the killing of any other innocent human being whose existence happened to be inconvenient to someone. The banning of the

sale of contraceptives would be quite a different case. However firmly one may accept the teaching of the Church in this matter, it is clearly a matter of private morality in which we should not seek to impose our views on others.

Divorce and the Common Good

A Catholic may believe that marriage is an indissoluble contract but feel, nevertheless, that if others do not agree there is no reason to interfere. Whilst it is possible for Catholics to take this attitude, it is by no means the only one open to them. Divorce may have consequences for society as a whole and not just for the individuals concerned. If we believe, for example, that a healthy family life is the basis of a sound society, then divorce laws which damaged family life would be contrary to the common good, and anyone would be justified in opposing such laws.

If we want to oppose a divorce law on these grounds, we need to make sure that our arguments are convincing. It would be necessary to show that there were, perhaps, seriously damaging effects upon the children of divorced parents. It would have to be shown that such children were more likely to become delinquent, or in some other way to become less useful members of society because their parents had been divorced. Moreover, it would be necessary to show that the damage done by divorce was greater than the damage done by the break up of a marriage without divorce, or by the parents continuing to live together in an atmosphere of hostility. The advocates of easier divorce would argue that divorce merely recognises that marriage has broken down, and that greater damage to society results from a failure to recognise this breakdown.

If there are socially damaging consequences of divorce, any measure for easier divorce may have a twofold effect. The short-run effect is the increase in the number of marriages broken up as a result of the new law. Over a longer period, the increasing ease with which divorce is available may lead to marriage being taken less seriously. The knowledge that there is an escape route may very well lead to young people

rushing into marriage with less thought than would otherwise be the case. This approach to marriage will mean that in an increasing proportion of cases a situation develops for which divorce would seem the obvious remedy.

This line of argument is logical enough, but it is by no means certain that much evidence could be found to support it. Divorces occur on an increasing scale, yet the great majority of marriages still appear successful and permanent.

I am not suggesting that divorce is not socially damaging, but I am suggesting that we should beware of using this argument until we have much stronger evidence. Like economists, Catholics are inclined to argue on the basis of how we think the world works and are disinclined to undertake serious empirical research to find out how it actually does work. In this particular context, it would be necessary to start by trying to find out, for example, whether there is more delinquency among the children of divorced parents than in the community as a whole. *Then*, it would be necessary to go further. Was there more delinquency among these children than others in similar income groups, or among children of widows or widowers, or among the children of unhappy marriages that were not dissolved. In this way, we would try to discover whether the high delinquency rate was the result of unhappy marriages, whether ending in divorce or not, and whether it was the result of divorce or of situations which might be associated with divorce. ⁽¹⁾

The Divorce Reform Bill

The bill before Parliament makes the irrevocable breakdown of marriage the sole ground of divorce. Nevertheless, it provides that five situations may be accepted as evidence of such breakdown. Three of these add little or nothing to the present law, allowing an injured party to petition for divorce on the grounds of adultery, cruelty or desertion. The fourth

1. Poverty or the absence of one parent might lead to similar results, whether resulting from divorce or not. If so, we might still argue divorce was undesirable because it created these situations which in turn had undesirable consequences.

case is that of so-called 'divorce by consent'. A petitioner may seek a divorce if the parties have lived apart for two years and the respondent does not object. (2) Finally, after five years' separation, a petition for divorce may be made even though the innocent party objects.

Divorce by consent may be socially damaging, but the evidence is not easily come by. Divorce against the wishes of the innocent party is another matter, for it is clearly an innovation which must inevitably involve in many cases serious injustice and hardship. Before granting a petition, the Courts must, it is true, take into account the financial arrangements which are to be made. In practice, however, the wording of the bill offers little protection to the innocent party. The Court must normally be satisfied that 'the financial provision made by the petitioner for the respondent is reasonable and fair *or the best that can be made in the circumstances.*' (3) What this provision means is that where a man has an income that carries him into the surtax bracket, he will be required to make adequate provision for his wife if he deserts her and then, five years later seeks a divorce. In a society that accepts divorce, there is little one can object to in this arrangement. After all, one cannot ensure by law that husband and wife continue to live together, and if the marriage has broken down nothing much is lost by the legal recognition of this fact.

If however, we look at the case of a man earning something like £22 a week, the national average, or even something much less, the situation is very different. Under such conditions, very considerable hardship may result for the deserted wife.

A Typical Case

A married man, with three children, earning £22 a week will be in a comparatively comfortable situation. Taking into account family allowances, income tax and National Insurance contributions, the family will have a disposable

2. Genuine consent is not necessarily the same thing as not objecting.

3. My italics

income of roughly £21 a week. Assuming the family to be paying £1 15s a week rent and rates, the Supplementary Benefit scale for this family would give them an income of roughly £12 10s a week (varying slightly according to the age of the children). Their actual income is, in fact, nearly 70 per cent greater than the appropriate Supplementary Benefit scale.

Now consider what happens if this family is split up by divorce, the wife is given the custody of the children and the man re-marries. What kind of contribution can the man be expected to make towards the support of his ex-wife and his children? The ex-wife will draw 38s a week in family allowances. If she continues to pay the same rent, she will need to be given an extra £9 8s just to bring her and the children up to the Supplementary Benefit scale. Can a man on the average wage of £22 a week be expected to pay £9 or more in maintenance to his former wife when he has re-married?

Income tax and National Insurance will leave him with roughly £20 a week to spend. If he and his new wife are to live even at the Supplementary Benefit scale, they will need something like £10 14s (again assuming a rent of £1 15s). Clearly, the cost of keeping the two households even at the Supplementary Benefit standard takes roughly the whole of the man's income after tax. If he were forced to pay on this scale, a man might just as well stop working and let the Ministry of Social Security support both of his families. In fact, the courts would not order maintenance on this scale to be paid.

Where a man is earning less than the average wage of £22 a week the position is, of course, even worse. Only where a man is earning substantially more than the average wage of £22 a week is there any real prospect of a divorced wife with several children receiving 'adequate' maintenance. Even then, we are thinking of adequacy in terms of minimum standards set by the Ministry of Social Security. These standards are by no means luxurious (perhaps rightly so) and for many divorced wives and their children will represent a disastrous

fall in living standards. The truth is that only a very well to do man can afford to support two families.

Supporters of the new legislation have opposed any suggestion that a divorce on the ground of five year separation alone should be refused unless adequate provision could be made in appropriate cases.

They opposed this because they said it would create one law for the rich and one for the poor. What they are determined not to see because they do not want to is that under their own proposals there will be very different treatment in effect for the rich and poor. They are reluctant to see their proposals modified so that the poor man is not able to dispose of an unwanted wife and leave the Ministry of Social Security to support her and her children. In the name of some crazy concept of egalitarianism, the man with a low income is to be given the same opportunities to get out of an unwanted marriage as the wealthy. But whereas the Courts may ensure that the wife of the wealthy man is adequately provided for, they are powerless to ensure reasonable provision for the wife of a poor man (or indeed the average man.) The so-called reformers do not, so they say, want one law for the rich and another for the poor. *But their own measures ensure that it is the innocent poor who suffer* because they prefer to pursue the goal of equality of opportunity for the guilty.

Some Further Considerations

The economic problems raised by divorce are, of course, greatest when a wife is left with young dependent children. If the children are older and she is able to work, the position will be a little easier. Nevertheless, there may still be hardship. A divorced wife may feel that she is compelled to work in order to raise her income above the bare subsistence provided by the Ministry of Social Security in circumstances which involve undue physical or mental strain or both.

Even in a case where it is possible for the woman to return to work without undue strain, her earning capacity may have been seriously reduced by marriage. She may, for example, not have worked for ten years while she had young children.

She may have reached the point where she would, in any case, have re-entered the labour market. If she is going back into a profession like teaching, she will be resuming at a salary very much less than that she would have reached if she had not married and been at home for ten years. This may be all right for the married woman returning to work to supplement the family income, or perhaps mainly for the work itself when the demands of the home have slackened. It is quite a different matter for the woman who may have to support herself and her children by her own efforts. ⁽⁴⁾ Even if a woman can support herself adequately, it is wrong that her husband should be allowed to desert her and escape all financial responsibility.

The position of the deserted wife will, of course, be even worse in a case where she married at an early age and failed to complete a training for a job matching her abilities. In such a case, she will find her earning power is limited, and, in addition, she may be forced into such employment as she can get with her limited training. A lot of people have to do jobs which are lacking in interest, but such jobs are particularly frustrating for somebody who has the ability but not the specialised training to do something more exacting.

As Catholics, we believe that divorce is wrong, that the marriage bond is indissoluble. A good many other people do not agree, and it would be unrealistic to suppose that we have much likelihood of getting them to change their ideas. On the other hand, to demonstrate that the changes now proposed (or even on the statute book by the time this appears) are likely to bring with them serious injustice and hardship is another matter. This is something that can be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt, as can the fact that where a defaulting husband cannot be made to support his ex-wife and family the burden is bound to fall on the rest of society.

4. If she has any substantial earnings from employment, she will have nothing further unless her ex-husband is making some payment to her. She can not, for example, try working half-time to supplement any payment from the Ministry of Social Security because such earnings would be deducted in full from the Ministry's scale of benefit.

Is shyness a symptom of pride? If people accept that "angels are out" how do they explain the fact that the devil is a person? A Catholic lecturer was quoted as saying "If you die unhappy, you die damned." Who is he to condemn the mass of mankind? The majority die unhappy.

Any Questions ?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Is shyness a symptom of pride ?

It is present in people long before they are capable of acquiring the moral virtues or vices, so it can't be a symptom of any of them. It is a natural dimension of personality. I should think most young children, like most young animals, have at least a touch of it — the world is new to them, and they are timid in face of its strangeness. They retreat from the unknown, and they come out of themselves only when their safety is somehow assured.

A sense of weakness or ignorance or inadequacy or inferiority stays with most people all their lives—or should stay with us in a degree which is in accordance with the essential dependence of our limited nature. An initial reserve with strangers is reasonable—it is not just a protection for our vulnerability but also a respect for their privacy. But, as we grow older, we have to learn how to esteem others more than we esteem ourselves and to give them the welcome of charity. Shyness, unless it is educated and made to take its place within a mature personality, can become a preoccupation with self, the wrong sort of self-consciousness that leads to fears and anxieties, envy and jealousy, touchiness, and an inability to use one's talents. Any initial shyness must not be allowed to get out of hand

and prevent us from trusting people and making life pleasanter for them.

Natural dispositions are not wholly subject to reason and will; but they can be controlled and made part of a balanced personality. Shyness can be brought into the person's service if he will accept himself from the providence of God and will have the courage of charity in his relations with others rather than the timidity of shyness.

If people accept the idea that "angels are out" how do they explain the fact that the devil is a person ?

They don't explain what you call "a fact": they deny it. As they have rejected belief in angels, they can't believe that there are fallen angels.

There are several puzzles in this matter of getting rid of the purely spiritual creation. I can understand the concern of Scripture scholars to discover, by the ordinary means of scholarship, what "angel" means in the Bible. Is it a word for an inspiration from God, or for a personal messenger from God, or for God Himself? Are illnesses of body and mind diabolical possession, or material evils produced by wicked spirits, or just ordinary physical defects attributed through ignorance to a non-existent spirit world? As there are spirits both good and evil in most religious systems, some of them prior to or contemporaneous with the writing of the Old Testament, could not the scripture angels and devils be merely a borrowing or a following of fashion?

The first puzzle appears when that reasonable enquiry comes up against the clear words of Our Lord in the New Testament. He taught the existence of personal angels, good and bad. Taking Him at His word, the Church has always believed in a world of personal spirits. The denial of their existence can be maintained only by saying that Christ did not know—and that is to depart from yet another strong Christian tradition. The ingenuity of the "demythologizers" is then employed to take the obvious meaning out of pronouncements of the Fourth Lateran and the First Vatican

Councils, and to justify refusal of the guidance of Pius XII.

The second puzzle is that so many who have their biblical knowledge at third or fourth hand prefer to follow their choice of scholar rather than the teaching and praying Church.

A Catholic lecturer was quoted to me the other day as saying: "If you die unhappy, you die damned." Who is he to condemn the mass of mankind? The majority die happy.

And who are you that know the state of the majority in their last moments?

Judgment on the lecturer depends, doesn't it, on the meaning he gave to happiness? I can see such a meaning—one that is philosophically reasonable—which makes his statement acceptable. Your indignation arises because, understandably, you have adopted the ordinary meaning of happiness as a feeling of contentment and well-being. The act of dying could well cause distress, both physical and mental, with concern for oneself and for the dependants one has to leave bereft of one's presence. That is not, superficially, a happy state. But happiness, in its deeper sense, is possible even in the most distressing conditions; and in that sense one is *obliged* to achieve it. It is defined by St. Thomas Aquinas—and Cicero and St. Augustine say the same—as "the perfect good which excludes all evil and satisfies all desires". The perfect good is union with God. In its perfection it is not attainable until after death; and that is why in this world "our heart is restless", as St. Augustine says in his *Confessions*; but the condition of our ultimate perfect union with God in eternity is that we must be united with Him in time by charity.

That union, effected by our keeping the great commandment of love, gives us possession of ourselves. We make our own person good, that is, real and actual. Evil, which would be an absence of our true self, is excluded by the presence of our genuine self; and our chief desire is effectively on the way to being satisfied. In that realistic

sense we have a duty to get the best of both worlds—happiness both here and hereafter.

In view of the recent Vatican instruction that the training of priests and religious should prepare them for an effective ministry in a rapidly changing world, may we expect the contemplative orders to abandon their medieval futilities?

That word “medieval” again!—used as though it were an argument whereas it is only an adjective of time. Some of our finest Christian traditions spring from the Middle Ages.

The tradition of complete dedication to God in the keeping of the first Commandment is as old as Christianity, and it is modern in any age. The contemplatives exercise the virtues of faith, hope and charity in continuous prayer, maintaining not only themselves but the whole human race in worship of God. Those who think little of the religious who spend their lives in contemplation will find that they have been despising their greatest human benefactors. In these days especially, when faith is growing cold and sociology is the new religion, we need people who have their priorities right and know that prayer is essential for the well-being of mankind.

Training that equips clergy and religious for the service of their fellows in a technological society will no doubt include instruction in communications, computerized diagnosis in medicine, working conditions in industry, antagonism between races, the psychology of dwellers in sky-scrapers and all the rest; but if it does not help to the formation of habits of prayer it will send out into the harvest labourers who don't know the first thing about their job. They have to show faith, hope and charity; and the act of each one of those virtues is prayer—the raising of mind and heart to God, in deliberate and grateful acceptance of His presence, His providence, and His eternal love; and, if they themselves are men and women of prayer, those they serve will learn to pray, and the world will be warmer.

BOOK REVIEWS

High Tide of Empire

Pax Britannica by James Morris; Faber, 50s. pp. 544.

The Washing of the Spears by Donald R. Morris; Sphere Paperback, 12s. 6d.; pp. 670.

Gubulawayo and Beyond by Michael Gelfand; Chapman, 63s.; pp. 496.

Mr. Morris has chosen his moment well. At a time when this country has come as close as ever likely to the bottom it does no harm to take a glance at her when she stood at the top. This is what the author of *Pax Britannica* has done. His book is an impression of the Old Queen's Empire as it was at the time of her Diamond Jubilee. That was only seventy-two years ago. It seems like another world.

In fact it was. The English stepped out of their Empire after the last war as casually as they had stepped into it a good many years before. History may yet record that, in so doing, they were true to the instinct of their race which has known, as a rule, when and how to choose the moment. History's verdict may favour the timing and manner of their withdrawal or it may not. All one can say now is that we are too close to the scene to view it objectively and in true perspective. Meanwhile, the achievement itself, as it was at its apogee, can be studied with reasonable objectivity. Excluded are those still suffering from an overdose of nostalgia on the one hand and on the other—and far worse—the mean-minded who deride every type of achievement. Even less incapable of understanding what Empire really meant to the English and how it came about are the ideologues of the Left whose dreary penchant for a priori thinking makes every kind of personal achievement no more than a matter of dubiously mixed motives or else the uninspired offshoot of environmental malaise.

This is doubly unfortunate in the case of the British Empire, which was acquired, as has been said, in a fit of absence of mind and stamped, as no other before it, by the immensely varied personalities of its builders. There is a passage in James Morris' book which illustrates this to perfection:

"A symbolically disconcerting proclamation was once made by the Aussalians at a place called Thursday Island, in the remote tropical north of Queensland. This was the very top of Australia, separated only by the narrow Torres Strait from New Guinea, the East India archipelago and Asia proper, and it was one of the hardest places in the world for a big ship to get to: when the British India boats sailed along there through the islands their captains often stayed on the bridge for four days and nights, worrying their vessels through the shallows. On Thursday Island, off the tip of Cape York, there was a little town and a naval station—1,500 souls in all, with some fifty whites and a shifting community of Malays, Polynesians, Chinese, a few Japanese pearl divers and a few aborigines. The flag of the Queensland Government flew above the Resident Magistrate's house, and there was a little wooden prison, a post office, a storehouse for the Royal Navy's Australian squadron, a couple of pubs, two or three shops and a courthouse. Immediately behind this clutch of buildings was the bush, and the Sound all about was littered with low sandy islands, baked in the heat.

"It was a dismal place, away beyond the never-never, but if the Australians ever stamped out of the Empire, Thursday Island might be remembered as their Concord, for it was here that they first showed the world their independence. For years the Queenslanders had been urging the Imperial Government to occupy the island of New Guinea across the water, to forestall the Germans or the French. The British, who had more than enough islands on their books, repeatedly declined: so on March 30, 1883, the day after the English mail-boat had left for London, leaving northern Queensland conveniently incommunicado, the Resident Magistrate at

Thursday Island posted a proclamation in his official notice-board. It announced the annexation of all New Guinea, not by the Imperial Government at all, but by the Government of Queensland. A day or two later the Magistrate sailed across the Torres Strait, and ceremonially planted the Union Jack upon the soil of Papua. The British first annulled the annexation in a huff, then agreed to declare a protectorate over the south-eastern part of the island; and when, in 1884, the Germans took the north-eastern coast for themselves, the Queenslanders were understandably piqued."

Marxist ideologues who choose to interpret this kind of action in terms of the dialectic—seeing it as the fruit of some remote clash of opposites — cannot really be said to know what they are talking about when it comes to an understanding of Britain's Empire and its builders. Yet, the Empire is full of this kind of incident. Men, like the Queensland Magistrate, plunking the Union Jack on a stretch of foreign soil, are everywhere in the pages of its history. It is no exaggeration to say that the Empire was built out of their efforts. Its story is essentially an affair of personalities. As such, its depiction at the high point of its triumph is admirably suited to so gifted an impressionist as James Morris. He has succeeded extraordinarily well. His ability to convey atmosphere, to point a period, has rarely been so well displayed. One realises as well, reading his delightful pages, that his fine impressionist writing is grounded in an acuteness of observation coupled with a meticulous care for detail that most would envy. If Mr. Morris' impression of Empire is at once so vivid and so rich, final reason must be found in a mastery of the particular circumstance that makes his wider picture of Britain's imperial achievement almost incredibly rich. How much is conveyed, for example, in his almost casual aside to the effect that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police retained their red tunics on patrol particularly in order that they should be easily recognisable by roving Red Indians as men of the Queen and not the American President. The blue-

coated troops of the latter stood for something far more unpredictable to the Indian mind than the red-jacketed police of the Old Queen: with these, the Indians knew, there was justice and the predictability of something dimly sensed as the rule of law.

Donald R. Morris' account of the rise and fall of the Zulu nation reads all the better when set within the context of his namesake's wider impressionism. Nevertheless, his work stands easily on its own as a brilliantly vivid account of Victorian imperialism as it affected one small territory of the many that looked, at the time of the Diamond Jubilee, to the protection of the Old Queen. Morris' prose is splendidly terse and fast-moving. There is a touch, almost, of Hemmingway about it; but without the feeling of a thing contrived that comes, to me personally, a little too often in Hemmingway's writing.

And, finally, whilst Briton and Boer and Zulu were in the final scrappy stages of the long-drawn fight that ended with Zululand becoming a British Protectorate in 1887, a group of Jesuit Fathers headed north from the Cape for Matabeleland and the foundation of the Zambezi Mission. They were a mixed bunch of varied nationalities, all alike in their relative ignorance of what lay before them; all alike also in the courage with which they pushed off into the unknown interior of a continent whose people they wanted to bring to the knowledge and love of God.

Their letters and journals over eight years—from 1879 to 1887—have been edited with obvious love and great care by Professor Michael Gelfand, at present Professor of Tropical Medicine at the University College of Rhodesia. For the past thirty years, the Professor has been on the friendliest terms with many English Jesuits attached to the Salisbury Mission; and his book is dedicated to the greatest, perhaps, of them all, Aston Ignatius Chichester, first Archbishop of Salisbury. In the production of this fascinating book, Professor Gelfand has been assisted by Father. W. F. Rea, an English Jesuit teaching now at the University.

Paul Crane, S.J.

READERS WRITE IN

(Another Batch)

Christian Order continues to sustain its high level of truth, topical interest, and clarity of thought in a somewhat confused Catholic atmosphere at present. We look forward to your further clarification of important Catholic truth in the next twelve months.—Luton, Beds.

I enjoy *Christian Order* very much — it is so sane and sensible.—Glasgow.

The magazine is an excellent one and deserves every encouragement for wider circulation.—Darlington.

A thousand thanks for a truly wonderful issue. *Christian Order* grows better and better.—Norfolk.

Your excellent little magazine *Christian Order* is both interesting and helpful in forming a correct opinion in these changing times.—Norway.

The April (1969) issue was so good.—London.

Christian Order is the very best magazine which comes my way. Sincere thanks and God bless you and your great work. I admire your fearlessness in calling a spade a spade.—Ireland.

Christian Order much appreciated. Many thanks.—Sussex.

Your Review, *Christian Order*, is highly appreciated by me and my students.—Malta.

Christian Order is more valuable than ever.—Ireland.

Your editorial helps to keep me sane.—London.

Well, there you are; and there are still more we could and probably will print. Someone actually asked whether I made these compliments up! I did not. They are perfectly genuine and they are unsolicited. They come in the letters that readers send me. From them I derive enormous encouragement. It is in the hope that you will do the same that they are printed here. If you have a friend who would like *Christian Order*, why not start him or her off with a subscription. Send £1 or \$3.00 to the Editor, 65 Belgrave Road, London, S.W. 1. We will do the rest.

N. P. MANDER LTD.

(Incorporating Henry Speechly & Sons, Established 1860)

PIPE ORGAN BUILDERS

At first glance our prices may not be competitive, but over the years they represent real value. Many instruments built nearly 100 years ago are still functioning perfectly with little more than ordinary maintenance. Our new organs are renowned for their reliability as well as for their tone

Organs as far away as U.S.A., Gibraltar, Africa and Bermuda give faithful service with maintenance calls very few and far between.

In Great Britain our tuners make regular calls to all parts and there are few Counties where we have no clients.

We have more than 50 of the finest craftsmen at our disposal and among our hundreds of clients are proud to name:—

- Westminster Abbey (small organ)
- Sheffield Cathedral
- British Broadcasting Corporation
- Campion Hall, Oxford
- St. John's Cathedral, Portsmouth
- St. Paul's Cathedral (2 small organs)
- Canterbury Cathedral (small organ)
- York Minster (small organ)
- Corpus Christi College, Cambridge
- Peterhouse, Cambridge.
- Jesus College, Cambridge.
- University Music School, Oxford
- University Music School, Cambridge
- Royal Academy of Music, etc.

We would be happy to advise you about the installation of a new organ or the restoration of an existing instrument.

Please mention *Christian Order* when writing:—

N. P. MANDER LTD.

ST. PETER'S ORGAN WORKS,
ST. PETER'S AVENUE, LONDON, E.2.
01-739-4747 (3 lines).